



UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10	BOOTZ INC.,	}	CASE NO. CV 12-10311 UA (DUTYx)
11	Plaintiff,		ORDER SUMMARILY REMANDING
12	vs.		IMPROPERLY-REMOVED ACTION
13	SHERMAN LEE, Does 1 through 10,		
14	Defendants.		

The Court will remand this unlawful detainer action to state court summarily because Defendant removed it improperly.

On December 3, 2012, Defendant, having been sued in what appears to be an action to quiet title in California state court, lodged a Motion for Removal of that action to this Court and also presented an application to proceed *in forma pauperis*. The Court has denied the latter application under separate cover because the action was not properly removed. To prevent the action from remaining in jurisdictional limbo, the Court issues this Order to remand the action to state court.

Simply stated, Plaintiff could not have brought this action in federal court in the first place, in that the complaint does not competently allege facts supplying either diversity or federal-question jurisdiction, and therefore removal is improper. 28 U.S.C. § 1441(a); see Exxon Mobil Corp v. Allapattah Svcs., Inc., 545 U.S. 546, 563, 125 S. Ct. 2611, 162 L. Ed. 2d 502 (2005). Defendants' notice of removal asserts that

1 federal question jurisdiction exists. (Motion at 4-6). However, the underlying action to
2 quiet title does not raise any federal legal question.

3 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that (1) this matter be REMANDED to the
4 Superior Court of California, Los Angeles County, Mosk Courthouse, 111 North Hill
5 Street, Los Angeles, California, 90012, for lack of subject matter jurisdiction pursuant
6 to 28 U.S.C. § 1447(c); (2) that the Clerk send a certified copy of this Order to the
7 state court; and (3) that the Clerk serve copies of this Order on the parties.

8 IT IS SO ORDERED.

9 DATED: 12/10/12

10 
11 _____
12 GEORGE H. KING
13 Chief United States District Judge
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28